arXiv:math/0610046v2 [math.NA] 30 Jun 2007

ERROR OF TIKHONOV'S REGULARIZATION FOR INTEGRAL CONVOLUTION EQUATIONS

DANG DUC TRONG AND TRUONG TRUNG TUYEN

ABSTRACT. Let φ be a nontrivial function of $L^1(\boldsymbol{R})$. For each $s \geq 0$ we put

$$p(s) = -\log \int_{|t|\geq s} |\varphi(t)| dt.$$

If φ satisfies

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{p(s)}{s} = \infty, \tag{0.1}$$

we obtain asymptotic estimates of the size of small-valued sets $B_\epsilon = \{x \in \boldsymbol{R} : \ |\widehat{\varphi}(x)| \leq \epsilon, \ |x| \leq R_\epsilon\}$ of Fourier transform

$$\widehat{\varphi}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ixt}\varphi(t)dt, \ x \in \boldsymbol{R},$$

in terms of $p(s)$ or in terms of its Young dual function

$$p^*(t) = \sup_{s\geq 0}[st - p(s)], \ t \geq 0.$$

Applying these results, we give an explicit estimate for the error of Tikhonov's regularization for the solution f of the integral convolution equation

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t-s)\varphi(s)ds = g(t),$$

where $f, g \in L^2(\boldsymbol{R})$ and φ is a nontrivial function of $L^1(\boldsymbol{R})$ satisfying condition (0.1), and g, φ are known non-exactly. Also, our results extend some results of [4] and [5].

1. INTRODUCTION

Let φ be a nontrivial function of $L^1(I\!R)$. Then its Fourier transform is defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ixt}\varphi(t)dt, \ x \in I\!R.$$

Date: February 2, 2008.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30D15, 31A15, 44A10, 65F22.

Key words and phrases. Class Cartwright; Cartan's theorem; Fourier and Laplace transforms; Integral convolution equation; Tikhonov's regularization; Young dual function.

If φ is of compact support, there associates an entire function of exponential type of Laplace transform type

$$\Phi(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{zt}\varphi(t)dt. \tag{1.1}$$

Generally, if $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{|t|s}|\varphi(t)|dt < \infty, \tag{1.2}$$

for all $s > 0$ then Φ in (1.1) is defined on all over the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ and is an entire function, but its order may be any positive number. If $\varphi \geq 0$ then condition (1.2) is also necessary for Φ to be an entire function. Indeed, in this case we have, for every $R > 0$,

$$\max_{|z|\leq R} |\Phi(z)| \geq \frac{1}{2}(\Phi(R) + \Phi(-R)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{|t|R}\varphi(t)dt.$$

As we will show in Section 2, the growth of $\Phi(z)$ is related to the function

$$p(s) = -\log \int_{|t|\geq s} |\varphi(t)|dt,\ s \geq 0. \tag{1.3}$$

In fact, Theorem 3 show that Young dual function $p^*(s)$ of $p(t)$, defined by

$$p^*(s) = \sup_{t\geq 0}[st - p(t)],\ s \geq 0,$$

is an appropriate quantity to estimate the growth of $\log|\Phi(z)|$. It turns out that φ satisfies (1.2) if and only if it satisfies

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{p(s)}{s} = \infty. \tag{1.4}$$

Properties of Fourier and Laplace transforms are of great interest because these functions often occur in different areas of calculus. As a typical application, Fourier transforms give us the direct solution of integral convolution equations. These problems, so-called deconvolution problems (see, e.g.[7]), arise in applications: an input signal f generates an output signal g by the formula

$$Af = \int_D \varphi(x,\gamma)f(\gamma)d\gamma = g(x),\ x \in D.$$

Often one has

$$Af = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(t-s)f(s)ds = g(t),\ t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.5}$$

where $\varphi(t) \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$. The deconvolution problem consists of finding f, given g and $\varphi(x,\gamma)$. For (1.5), another problem, so-called the identification problem, is of practical interest: given f and g, find $\varphi(t)$. The function $\varphi(t)$ characterizes the linear system which generates the output $g(t)$ given the input $f(t)$.

Now if f is the solution of (1.5), applying Fourier transform to both sides of (1.5) we get

$$\widehat{f} = \frac{\widehat{g}}{\widehat{\varphi}}. \tag{1.6}$$

Then apply the inverse Fourier transform we find f. We may see easily from equation (1.6) that f depends nonlinearly on φ.

As easily seen, in case φ has compact support, the set of zeros of $\widehat{\varphi}(z) \equiv \Phi(-iz)$ effects largely the recovering the function f from its Fourier transform. Since $\widehat{\varphi}(z)$ is a function of class Cartwright, that is

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\log^+ |\widehat{\varphi}(t)|}{1+t^2} dt \le \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\log^+ ||\varphi||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}{1+t^2} dt < \infty,$$

the distribution of its zeros is well known (see, e.g., [6]). In a recent paper [9], Sedletskii obtained some detailed properties of the set of zeros of Φ for a subclass of functions f that is of $L^1(0,1)$ and positive (see also references in [9]).

However, for really computing the solution f and for the regularization of equation (1.5), we must know more about the structure of the small-valued sets of Φ. This problem goes back to the well-known theorem of Cartan about the size of the small-valued sets $B_\epsilon = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ |P(z)| \le \epsilon\}$ where $P(z)$ is a polynomial. He proved that B_ϵ is contained in a finite of disks whose sum of radii is less than $C_1 \epsilon^{\frac{1}{n}}$ where n is the degree of $P(z)$ and C_1 is a constant that depends only on the leading coefficient of $P(z)$ and n (see Theorem 3 of §11.2 in [6]). In particularly we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} m(B_\epsilon) = 0, \tag{1.7}$$

where $m(.)$ is the Lebesgue's measure. For general case of entire functions, the conclusion (1.7) does not hold, for even simple functions such as e^z, instead of many results representing the structure of B_ϵ (see, e.g., [6]).

Recently, in seeking regularization schemes for the problem of determination of heat source in one and two dimensional, the authors in [4] and [5] proved that Φ in (1.1) has only finitely many zeros on the positive real-axis if φ is of a fairly wide subclass of $L^2(0,1)$. Indeed, as easily seen, the results in [4] and [5] depend only on the estimate of the size of the set

$$B_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \ |\Phi(x)| \le \epsilon, |x| \le R_\epsilon\},$$

where γ, Φ are as above and $R_\gamma > 0$ depends on γ.

In this paper, we will give some asymptotic estimates for the small-valued sets

$$B_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \ |\widehat{\varphi}(x)| \le \epsilon, |x| \le R_\epsilon\},$$

to functions φ satisfying condition (1.4) and apply these estimates to the Tikhonov's regularization of Problem (1.5). Also, our results extend some results in [4] and [5]. For convenience, we recall briefly Tikhonov's regularization before stating results.

The difficulty of applying direct formula (1.6) arises in two aspects: one, in reality we can not have the exact data (φ_0, g_0) but only the measured data $(\varphi_\epsilon, g_\epsilon)$, and two, even for the case in which we have the exact data, the inverse Fourier transform may not be efficiently computed if $\widehat{\varphi_0}$ has zeros on the real axis. Hence a regularization is needed.

Let $\epsilon > 0$, we denote by (φ_0, g_0) the exact data and $(\varphi_\epsilon, g_\epsilon)$ the measured data with the tolerable error ϵ, that is

$$\epsilon \geq \max\{||\varphi_0 - \varphi_\epsilon||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}, ||g_0 - g_\epsilon||_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\}. \tag{1.8}$$

Tikhonov's regularization applied to equation (1.5) is to construct an approximation f_ϵ whose Fourier transform is

$$\widehat{f}_\epsilon = \frac{\widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2}, \tag{1.9}$$

where $\delta_\epsilon > 0$ is a regularization parameter appropriately chosen depending on ϵ.

We have the following general estimate for the error $||f_0 - f_\epsilon||_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ (see also [2] and Chapter 10 in [3] for similar estimates).

Theorem 1. *Let* β *be a constant in* $(0, \frac{1}{3})$. *Let* $f_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ *be the exact solution of (1.5) corresponding to* $\varphi_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, $g_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. *Let* $\epsilon > 0$ *be small,* $\varphi_\epsilon, g_\epsilon$ *be as in (1.8) and let* f_ϵ *be as in (1.9), where* $\delta_\epsilon = \sqrt[4]{\frac{C_1}{C_2}}\epsilon^{(1+3\beta)/2}$ *and*

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= 4(1 + ||g_0||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + ||\varphi_0||^2_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}), \\ C_2 &= 1 + ||g_0||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $R_\epsilon > 0$ *be a sequence such that*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \longrightarrow 0} R_\epsilon = \infty.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} ||f_0 - f_\epsilon||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq\ & 3[\int_{|\lambda| > R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} |F(f_0)|^2 d\lambda \\ & + \int_{|\lambda| < R_\epsilon, |\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)| < \epsilon^\beta} |F(f_0)|^2 d\lambda + 2\sqrt{C_1 C_2}\epsilon^{1-3\beta}], \end{aligned}$$

where $F(f_0)(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_0(x) e^{-i\lambda x} dx$ *is the Fourier transform of* f_0 *and* $\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi_0(x) e^{-i\lambda x} dx$ *is the Fourier transform of* φ_0.

If φ_0 satisfies condition (1.2), we can show that the bound of $||f_0 - f_\epsilon||_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ in above Theorem decreases to zero as ϵ decreases to zero. This assertion comes easily from

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{\epsilon\longrightarrow 0}\int_{|\lambda|>R_\epsilon,|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|<\epsilon^\beta}|F(f_0)|^2d\lambda+\int_{|\lambda|<R_\epsilon,|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|<\epsilon^\beta}|F(f_0)|^2d\lambda\\ = &\lim_{\epsilon\longrightarrow 0}\int_{I\!\!R}\chi_{\{|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|<\epsilon^\beta\}}|F(f_0)|^2d\lambda=0,\end{aligned}$$

by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem.

However, to get a more explicit estimate for $||f_0-f_\epsilon||_{L^2(I\!\!R)}$ some a-priopri information about f_0 must be assumed. For example, in Chapter 10 of [3] (see also [2]), the author gave estimates for $||f_0-f_\epsilon||_{L^2(I\!\!R)}$ in the case the kernel φ_0 is of two special types of L^1 functions (see conditions (10.4) and (10.10) in [3]) and in additionally, the solution f_0 satisfies the condition

$$(1.10)\quad |\widehat{f_0}(\lambda)|^2\le C_1(1+|\lambda|^2)^{-q},\lambda\in I\!\!R,$$

for some $q>\frac{1}{2}$.

Condition (10.4) in [3] is a set of four conditions and condition (10.10) in [3] is that

$$(1.11)\quad |\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|^2\ge C_0e^{-a\lambda},\ \lambda>0,$$

where $a,C>0$ are constants. While condition (1.10) imposed on f_0 is natural and is easily verified (for example, if $f_0\in W^{1,1}(I\!\!R)$ we have $|\widehat{f_0}(\lambda)|^2\le C_0(1+|\lambda|^2)^{-1}$), conditions (10.4) and (10.10) above may not hold for a general kernel $\varphi_0\in L^1(I\!\!R)$ and fairly difficult to verify for a concrete kernel φ_0 in particularly in the case φ_0 is known non-exactly.

In this paper, we will give estimates for error of Tikhonov's regularization for Problem (1.5) for the case the solution f_0 satisfies (1.10) and the kernel φ_0 satisfies (1.4). As we will show in Section 2, this class consists of functions satisfying condition (1.2).

For each $\epsilon>0$ we put

$$(1.12)\quad s_\epsilon=\inf\{s>0:\ e^{-p(s)}\le\epsilon\},$$

where $p(s)$ is as in (1.4).

Our main result is the following theorem. The estimate of our result in the case φ_0 has compact support is comparable to the estimate $||f_0-f_\epsilon||_{L^2(I\!\!R)}\le C(\log\frac{1}{\epsilon})^{-q+\frac{1}{2}}$ gave in Theorem 10.8 in [3] (which uses additionally condition (1.11) in its proof).

Theorem 2. *Let assumptions be as in Theorem 1. In additional, assume that f_0 satisfies condition (1.10) and φ_0 satisfies condition (1.4). For $\epsilon>0$ small enough choose s_ϵ as in (1.12) and $R_\epsilon>0$ satisfying*

$$[(q+\frac{1}{2})\log R_\epsilon+\log(15e^3)][\log||\varphi_0||_{L^1(I\!\!R)}+2es_\epsilon R_\epsilon]=-\log(\epsilon^\beta+\epsilon).$$

Then

$$\lim_{\epsilon\longrightarrow 0}R_\epsilon=\infty,$$

and there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ *independent of* ϵ *such that*

$$||f_0 - f_\epsilon||_{L^2(I\!\!R)} \le C_3 R_\epsilon^{-q+\frac{1}{2}},$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ *small enough. In particular, in case* φ_0 *is of compact support then* s_ϵ *is bounded for* $\epsilon > 0$ *small enough, hence*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \longrightarrow 0} \frac{\log R_\epsilon}{\log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}} = 1.$$

Proof. The existence of R_ϵ is easily seen by considering the function

$$f(R) = [(q + \frac{1}{2}) \log R + \log(15e^3)][\log ||\varphi_0||_{L^1(I\!\!R)} + 2es_\epsilon R],\ \ R \ge 0.$$

Condition (1.4) gives

$$\lim_{\epsilon \longrightarrow 0} R_\epsilon = \infty.$$

By Theorem 1 and condition (1.10), there exists $C_4 > 0$ such that

$$||f_0 - f_\epsilon||_{L^2(I\!\!R)} \le C_4(R^{-q+\frac{1}{2}} + m(B_\epsilon) + \epsilon^{1-3\beta}),$$

where $m(B_\epsilon)$ is the Lebesgue's measure of the set

$$B_\epsilon = \{x \in I\!\!R :\ |\widehat{\varphi_0}(x)| \le \epsilon^\beta,\ |x| \le R_\epsilon\}.$$

Now apply Theorem 5 we get the conclusion of Theorem 2. $\square$

The rest of this paper consists of three sections. In Section 2 we explore some properties of entire functions of Laplace transform type. In Section 3 we state and prove estimates of the size of small-valued sets for entire functions of Laplace transform type and for Fourier transforms. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.

2. Properties of Laplace transforms

In this section we explore some properties of entire functions of type (1.1), where $\varphi \in L^1(I\!\!R)$ satisfies condition (1.2).

First we consider the case φ has a compact support. Without loss of generality, we assume the support of φ is contained in $[0, 1]$. So the function Φ in (1.1) take a simpler form

$$\Phi(z) = \int_0^1 e^{zt} \varphi(t) dt,$$

where $\varphi(t)$ is a nontrivial function of $L^1(0, 1)$.

We put

$$\sigma = \inf\{a \in [0, 1] : \varphi|_{[a,1]} = 0\ a.e.\},$$
$$\mu = \sup\{a \in [0, 1] : \varphi|_{[0,a]} = 0\ a.e.\}.$$

Lemma 1. *(On order and type of Φ)*
i) Order of Φ is unity.
ii) Type of Φ is σ.
iii) We have

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{R\to\infty}\frac{\log|\Phi(R)|}{R} &= \sigma,\\ \limsup_{R\to\infty}\frac{\log|\Phi(-R)|}{R} &= -\mu.\end{aligned}$$

Before proving Lemma 1 we recall that (see e.g. [6]) if $\Phi(z)$ is an entire function then its order ρ (or $ord(\Phi)$ for short) and type σ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= \limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log\log M_\Phi(r)}{\log r},\\ \sigma &= \limsup_{r\to\infty}\frac{\log M_\Phi(r)}{r^\rho},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$M_{\Phi(r)} = \max_{|z|\le r}|\Phi(z)|.$$

Proof. i) We have

$$|\Phi(z)| \le Ce^{|z|},$$

for $z\in \mathbb{C}$ and $C = ||\varphi||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$. It follows that $ord(\Phi)\le 1$.

Now we show $ord(\Phi) = 1$. Assume by contradiction that $ord(\Phi) < 1$.

Applying Theorem 1 in §6.1 in [6] for domains $\{-\frac{\pi}{2} < \arg z < \frac{\pi}{2}\}$ and $\{\frac{\pi}{2} < \arg z < \frac{3\pi}{2}\}$, noting that Φ is bounded on the imaginery-axis, we have that Φ is bounded on $\mathbb{C}$. Thus Φ is a constant, so $\Phi'(z)\equiv 0$. Thus we have $t\varphi\equiv 0$ or equivalently $\varphi\equiv 0$, since

$$\Phi'(z) = \int_0^1 e^{zt}t\varphi(t)dt,$$

which is a contradiction.

ii) We have the type of Φ is less than or equal to σ because

$$|\Phi(z)| = |\int_0^\sigma e^{zt}\varphi(t)dt| \le e^{\sigma|z|}\int_0^\sigma|\varphi(t)|dt.$$

We prove an equivalent result: If $a\in[0,1]$ is so that φ is not identity to zero in $[a,1]$ then the type of Φ is greater than or equal to a.

We assume by contradiction that the type of Φ is less than a.

We consider the function

$$\Gamma(z) = e^{-az}\int_a^1 e^{zt}\varphi(t)dt.$$

If $z > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(z)| &= |e^{-az}\Phi(z) - e^{-az}\int_0^a e^{zt}\varphi(t)| \\ &\to 0 \end{aligned}$$

when $z \to +\infty$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Indeed, because of our contradiction assumption that the type of Φ is less than a it follows

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} e^{-az}\Phi(z) = 0,$$

while by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem applied to the sequence $g_z(t) = e^{z(t-a)}\varphi(t)$ on $[0, a]$ it follows that

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} e^{-az}\int_0^a e^{zt}\varphi(t)dt = \lim_{z\to\infty}\int_0^a g_z(t)dt = 0.$$

If $z < 0$, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem as above we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(z)| &= e^{a|z|}|\int_a^1 e^{-|z|t}\varphi(t)dt| \\ &\to 0 \end{aligned}$$

when $z \to -\infty$ on $\mathbb{R}$.

If z is purely imaginery, we have

$$|\Gamma(z)| \le C.$$

Applying Theorem 1 in §6.1 in [6] for domains $\{0 < \arg z < \frac{\pi}{2}\}$, $\{\frac{\pi}{2} < \arg z < \pi\}$, $\{\pi < \arg z < \frac{3\pi}{2}\}$ and $\{\frac{3\pi}{2} < \arg z < 2\pi\}$ we get $|\Gamma(z)| \le C$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, which implies that $\Gamma(z) =$constant, a contradiction (qed).

iii) We prove similarily to the proof of ii). We prove first that

$$\limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(-R)|}{R} = -\mu.$$

If $R > 0$ we have

$$|\Phi(-R)| = |\int_\mu^1 e^{-Rt}\varphi(t)dt| \le e^{-R\mu}||\varphi||_{L^1(0,1)},$$

hence

$$\limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(-R)|}{R} \le -\mu.$$

Thus, in order to prove the equality required, we need to show only that: if $a > \mu$ then

$$\limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(-R)|}{R} \ge -a.$$

Assume by contradiction that

$$\limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(-R)|}{R} < -a,$$

for some $a > \mu$. We consider

$$\Gamma(z) = e^{-az} \int_0^a e^{zt} \varphi(t) dt.$$

By arguments in ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{R\to\infty} |\Gamma(R)| &= 0, \\ \lim_{R\to\infty} |\Gamma(-R)| &= \lim_{R\to\infty} |e^{aR}\Phi(-R) - e^{aR} \int_a^1 e^{-Rt}\varphi(t)dt| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus as in ii) we have $\Gamma(z)$ is a constant, which is a contradiction.

The proof of

$$\limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log |\Phi(R)|}{R} = \sigma$$

is similar and indeed was contained in the proof of ii). □

Lemma 2. *(On zeros of Φ)*

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} n(R) = \infty$$

and

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \frac{n(R)}{R} = \frac{d}{\pi} := \frac{\sigma - \mu}{\pi},$$

where $n(R) = \{z : \ |z| \le R, \ \Phi(z) = 0\}$.

Proof. First we show that Φ has infinitely many zeros. Indeed, if Φ has only finitely many zeros, since Φ is of order 1, by Hadamard's theorem we may write

$$\Phi(z) = e^{az} P(z),$$

where P is a polynomial.

So if we differentiate $e^{-az}\Phi(z)$ m times, where m is greater than the order of $P(z)$ we obtain

$$\int_0^1 e^{z(t-a)} (t-a)^m \varphi(t) dt \equiv 0,$$

so $\varphi \equiv 0$, a contradiction.

We have $|\Phi(it)| \le C = ||\varphi||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$ if $t \in \mathbb{R}$. So

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\log^+ |\Phi(it)|}{1+t^2} dt \le \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\log^+ C}{1+t^2} dt < \infty.$$

Thus $\Phi(iz)$ is of class Cartwright (see Lecture 16 in [6]).

Applying Theorem 1 of §17.2 in [6], we have

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \frac{n(R)}{R} = \frac{d}{\pi}$$

where d is the width of the indicator diagram of $\Phi(iz)$, i.e.

$$d = \limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(R)|}{R} + \limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(-R)|}{R}.$$

By Lemma 1 iii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(R)|}{R} &= \sigma, \\ \limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(-R)|}{R} &= -\mu. \end{aligned}$$

So $d = \sigma - \mu$. □

Lemma 3. *(On representation of Φ). Denote $\mathbb{C}^+ = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ Imz > 0\}$. i.e. $\mathbb{C}^+$ is the upper half-plane. Then*

$$\Phi(z) = Cz^m e^{\frac{\sigma+\mu}{2}z} \prod_{z_i\in\mathbb{R}} (1 - \frac{z}{z_i}) \prod_{z_i\in\mathbb{C}^+} (1 - z(\frac{1}{z_i} + \frac{1}{\overline{z_i}}) + \frac{z^2}{|z_i|^2}),$$

where $C \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Applying Theorem 1 of §17.2 in [6] for $\Phi(iz)$, if $\{z_k\}, z_k \neq 0$ are zeros of Φ then

$$\sum_k |Re\frac{1}{z_k}| < \infty.$$

Applying Hadamard's theorem, noting that $\Phi(\overline{z}) = \overline{\Phi(z)}$, we may write

$$\Phi(z) = Cz^m e^{az} \lim_{r\to\infty} [\prod_{z_i\in\mathbb{R}, |z_i|\le r} (1 - \frac{z}{z_i}) \prod_{z_i\in\mathbb{C}^+, |z_i|\le r} (1 - \frac{z}{z_i})(1 - \frac{z}{\overline{z_i}}) e^{z(\frac{1}{z_i} + \frac{1}{\overline{z_i}})}].$$

Since $ord(\Phi) = 1$ we have

$$\sum_{z_i} \frac{1}{|z_i|^2} < \infty.$$

This, combined with the event that $\frac{1}{z_i} + \frac{1}{\overline{z_i}} = 2Re\frac{1}{z_i}$ and the inequality above

$$\sum_k |Re\frac{1}{z_k}| < \infty,$$

allows us to write

$$\Phi(z) = Cz^m e^{bz} \prod_{z_i\in\mathbb{R}} (1 - \frac{z}{z_i}) \prod_{z_i\in\mathbb{C}^+} (1 - \frac{z}{z_i})(1 - \frac{z}{\overline{z_i}}).$$

That $C, b \in \mathbb{R}$ is easy to see. Now we show that $b = \frac{\sigma+\mu}{2}$.

If $z_i \notin \mathbb{R}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}|(1-\frac{z}{z_i})(1-\frac{z}{\overline{z_i}})| &= |1-z(\frac{1}{z_i}+\frac{1}{\overline{z_i}})+\frac{z^2}{|z_i|^2}| \\ &\leq 1+|z||\frac{1}{z_i}+\frac{1}{\overline{z_i}}|+\frac{|z|^2}{|z_i|^2} \\ &\leq (1+|z||\frac{1}{z_i}+\frac{1}{\overline{z_i}}|)(1+\frac{|z|^2}{|z_i|^2}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $z \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$|\Phi(z)| \leq |e^{bz}|F_1(|z|)F_2(|z|)F_3(|z|)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}F_1(z) &= |C|z^m \prod_{z_i \in \mathbb{R}}(1+\frac{z}{|z_i|}), \\ F_2(z) &= \prod_{z_i \in \mathbb{C}^+}(1+z|\frac{1}{z_i}+\frac{1}{\overline{z_i}}|), \\ F_3(z) &= \prod_{z_i \in \mathbb{C}^+}(1+\frac{z^2}{|z_i|^2}).\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_k |Re\frac{1}{z_k}| < \infty,$$

we have that F_1 and F_2 are of minimal type. Moreover it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\frac{\log|F_1(R)|}{R} = \lim_{R\to\infty}\frac{\log|F_2(R)|}{R} = 0.$$

Now if we arranges $\{z_k\},\ z_k \in \mathbb{C}^+$ increasely by norms $0 < |z_1| = |\overline{z_1}| \leq |z_2| = |\overline{z_2}| \leq |z_3| = |\overline{z_3}|...$ and put $\lambda_k = |z_k|$ then Theorem 1 of §17.2 in [6] gives

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{n}{\lambda_n} = \frac{d}{2\pi} = \frac{\sigma-\mu}{2\pi}.$$

So we can apply Theorem 2 of §12.1 in [6] for $F_3(iz)$ to get

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\frac{\log|F_3(R)|}{R} = \frac{d}{2} = \frac{\sigma-\mu}{2}.$$

Now if $R > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\log|\Phi(R)|}{R} &\leq b+\frac{\log|F_1(R)|}{R}+\frac{\log|F_2(R)|}{R}+\frac{\log|F_3(R)|}{R}, \\ \frac{\log|\Phi(-R)|}{-R} &\geq b+\frac{\log|F_1(R)|}{-R}+\frac{\log|F_2(R)|}{-R}+\frac{\log|F_3(R)|}{-R}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma = \limsup_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(R)|}{R} &\leq \lim_{R\to\infty}[b + \frac{\log|F_1(R)|}{R} + \frac{\log|F_2(R)|}{R} + \frac{\log|F_3(R)|}{R}] \\
&= b + \frac{\sigma-\mu}{2}, \\
\mu = \liminf_{R\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(-R)|}{-R} &\geq \lim_{R\to\infty}[b + \frac{\log|F_1(R)|}{-R} + \frac{\log|F_2(R)|}{-R} + \frac{\log|F_3(R)|}{-R}] \\
&= b - \frac{\sigma-\mu}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

From above two inequalities we get

$$b = \frac{\sigma+\mu}{2}.$$

□

Now we consider the general case of kernel $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying condition (1.2).

Lemma 4. *A function $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies condition (1.2) if and only if it satisfies condition (1.4). In this case $\Phi(z)$ defined by (1.1) is an entire function.*

Proof. If φ satisfies condition (1.2), for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $A_n < \infty$ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{n|t|}|\varphi(t)|dt \leq A_n.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \limsup_{s\to\infty} \frac{\log \int_{|t|\geq s} e^{|t|n}|\varphi|dt}{s} \\
&\geq \limsup_{s\to\infty} \frac{\log \int_{|t|\geq s} e^{sn}|\varphi|dt}{s} \\
&= n + \limsup_{s\to\infty} \frac{\log \int_{|t|\geq s} |\varphi|dt}{s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Because n is arbitrary, we have

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{\log \int_{|t|\geq s} |\varphi(t)|dt}{s} = -\infty.$$

So φ satisfies (1.4).

Conversely, if φ satisfies (1.4), we take $p(s)$ be as in (1.3), that is

$$p(s) = -\log \int_{|t|\geq s} |\varphi(t)|dt, \ \ s \geq 0.$$

Consider the function

$$H(s) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{|t|s}|\varphi(t)|dt.$$

Because $\frac{d}{ds}e^{-p(s)} = -(|\varphi(s)| + |\varphi(-s)|)$ and φ satisfies (1.4), using integration by parts we get

$$\begin{aligned} H(s) &= -e^{ts-p(t)}|_0^\infty + s\int_0^\infty e^{ts-p(t)}dt \\ &= ||\varphi||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + s\int_0^\infty e^{ts-p(t)}dt < \infty \end{aligned}$$

for any $s \geq 0$, so φ satisfies (1.4).

When φ satisfies (1.4), $\Phi(z)$ is clearly an entire function and

$$|\Phi(z)| \leq H(|z|).$$

□

As Lemma 4 shows, the growth of $\Phi(z)$ is determinated by the function

$$G(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{ts-p(t)}dt. \tag{2.1}$$

From now on we assume that φ satisfies (1.2). For the sake of simplicity, we assume also that φ has a non-compact support, so $p(s) < \infty$ for all $s \geq 0$.

It turns out that the growth of $G(s)$ in (2.1) is related to Young dual function $p^*(s)$ of $p(s)$, which is defined by

$$p^*(s) = \sup_{t\geq 0}[st - p(t)], \;\; s \geq 0.$$

It is easy to verify that p^* is convex and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} p(t) + p^*(s) &\geq st, \;\; s, t \geq 0, \\ \lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{p^*(s)}{s} &= \infty. \end{aligned}$$

(see for e.g. Lecture 25 in [6]). So we can define Young dual function p^{**} of p^*. This function satisfies $p^{**}(t) \leq p(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$.

We have the following result

Theorem 3. *Let φ be a function of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ with non-compact support. Define p(s) as in (1.3) and Young dual function $p^*(s)$ and Young double-dual function $p^{**}(s)$ as above. Define $G(s)$ by (2.1). Then*

$$\liminf_{s\to\infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} \geq 1,$$

and for any $\kappa > 0$

$$\limsup_{s\to\infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s+\kappa)} \leq 1.$$

If additionally we have one of the following two conditions

$$\exp\{-p(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma}p(t\gamma)\} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}), \tag{2.2}$$

for all $1 > \gamma > 0$ *close enough to* 1*, or*

$$\exp\{-p^{**}(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma}p^{**}(t\gamma)\} \in L^1(I\!\!R), \tag{2.3}$$

for all $1 > \gamma > 0$ *close enough to* 1*, then*

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} = 1.$$

Proof. Because of properties of $p(s)$, for each $s > 0$ large enough we can find a $t_s > 0$ such that

$$st_s \geq p(t_s) + p^*(s) - \frac{1}{2},$$

and

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} t_s = \infty.$$

We have

$$G(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{ts-p(t)}dt \geq \int_{t_s-1}^{t_s} e^{ts-p(t)}dt.$$

Now fixed γ be any number less than 1. By above inequality we have

$$e^{-\gamma p^*(s)}G(s) \geq e^{(1-\gamma)p^*(s)} \int_{t_s-1}^{t_s} e^{ts-p(t)-p^*(s)}dt.$$

Because $p(t)$ in (1.3) is increasing, for $t_s - 1 \leq t \leq t_s$ we have

$$ts - p(t) - p^*(s) \geq s(t_s - 1) - p(t_s) - p^*(s) \geq -s - \frac{1}{2}.$$

So

$$e^{-\gamma p^*(s)}G(s) \geq e^{(1-\gamma)p^*(s)-s-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Because of

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{p^*(s)}{s} = \infty,$$

we get that

$$\liminf_{s\to\infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} \geq 1.$$

Now for any $\kappa > 0$ we have $p(t) + p^*(s+\kappa) \geq st + \kappa t$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-p^*(s+\kappa)}G(s) &= \int_0^\infty e^{ts-p(t)-p^*(s+\kappa)}dt \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty e^{-\kappa t}dt = \frac{1}{\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\limsup_{s\to\infty} \frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s+\kappa)} \leq 1.$$

Now assume that (2.2) or (2.3) is satisfied. Fixed $1 > \gamma > 0$ close enough to 1. We have

$$\sup_{s\geq 0}[st - \frac{1}{\gamma}p^*(s)] = \frac{1}{\gamma}\sup_{s\geq 0}[s.(\gamma t) - p^*(s)] = \frac{1}{\gamma}p^{**}(\gamma t).$$

Hence for all $t \geq 0$ we have

$$st - p(t) - \frac{1}{\gamma}p^*(s) \leq -p(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma}p^{**}(\gamma t).$$

Because $p^{**}(t) \leq p(t)$ from above inequality we get

$$st - p(t) - \frac{1}{\gamma}p^*(s) \leq \min\{-p(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma}p(\gamma t), -p^{**}(t) + \frac{1}{\gamma}p^{**}(\gamma t)\}.$$

Hence

$$e^{st-p(t)-\frac{1}{\gamma}p^*(s)} \leq \min\{e^{-p(t)+\frac{1}{\gamma}p(\gamma t)}, e^{-p^{**}(t)+\frac{1}{\gamma}p^{**}(\gamma t)}\},$$

for all $s \geq 0$.

We have

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} e^{st-p(t)-\frac{1}{\gamma}p^*(s)} = 0,$$

for all $t \geq 0$, so we can apply Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem to get

$$\limsup_{s\to\infty}\frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma},$$

for all $1 > \gamma > 0$ close enough to 1, so it follows

$$\limsup_{s\to\infty}\frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} \leq 1.$$

Because we proved before that

$$\liminf_{s\to\infty}\frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} \geq 1,$$

we get that

$$\lim_{s\to\infty}\frac{\log G(s)}{p^*(s)} = 1.$$

□

Remark 1. *If $\varphi \geq 0$ then $\Phi(z)$ in (1.1) satisfies*

$$\max_{|z|\leq s}|\Phi(z)| \geq \frac{1}{2}H(s),$$

where $H(s)$ is the function defined in the proof of Lemma 4. So Theorem 3 shows that $p^*(|z|)$ is an appropriate quantity to estimate the growth of $\log|\Phi(z)|$.

Remark 2. *If* φ *has the support in* $[0,1]$ *and*

$$\sigma = \inf\{a \in [0,1] : \ \varphi|_{[a,1]} = 0 \ a.e.\},$$

then it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{p^*(s)}{\sigma s} = 1,$$

so by Theorem 3 we obtain again the familiar result

$$\limsup_{|z|\to\infty} \frac{\log|\Phi(z)|}{|z|} \le \sigma.$$

Remark 3. *The class of functions* $p(t)$ *satisfying conditions (1.4) and (2.2) are fairly large. For example we can take* $p(t) = t\log t$ *or* $p(t) = t^\gamma$ *for any* $\gamma > 1$.

3. The size of small-valued sets

In this section, we estimate the size of small-valued sets of Fourier transforms, i.e., estimate the Lebesgue measure of the sets

$$B_\epsilon = \{x \in I\!\!R : \ |\widehat{\varphi}(x)| \le \epsilon, \ |x| \le R_\epsilon\},$$

where φ is a nontrivial function of $L^1(I\!\!R)$ satisfying condition (1.4), R_ϵ depends on small numbers ϵ and

$$\widehat{\varphi}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-itx}\varphi(t)dt, \ x \in I\!\!R.$$

We will estimate these small-valued sets in terms of the function $p(s)$ defined by (1.3) or in terms of its Young dual function $p^*(s)$.

First we obtain estimates in terms of $p(s)$. We define

$$\varphi^\epsilon(t) = \begin{cases} \varphi(t) & \text{if } |t| \le s_\epsilon \\ 0 & \text{if } |t| > s_\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^\epsilon(z) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{zt}\varphi^\epsilon(t)dt \equiv \int_{-s_\epsilon}^{s_\epsilon} e^{zt}\varphi(t)dt, \\ \widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(z) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-izt}\varphi^\epsilon(t)dt \equiv \int_{-s_\epsilon}^{s_\epsilon} e^{-izt}\varphi(t)dt, \end{aligned}$$

where s_ϵ is defined by (1.12).

It is easy to see that $\Phi^\epsilon(-iz) = \widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(z)$ are entire functions of order 1 and type $\le s_\epsilon$. More explicitly

$$|\widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(z)| \le ||\varphi||_{L^1(I\!\!R)} e^{s_\epsilon|z|}.$$

By the definition of s_ϵ, we see that if $x \in I\!\!R$ then

$$|\widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(x) - \widehat{\varphi}(x)| \le \epsilon.$$

First we estimate the size of small-valued sets of Φ^ϵ. We have the following result

Theorem 4. *Let* s_ϵ, Φ^ϵ, *be as above. Let* $q > \frac{1}{2}$, $\beta > 0$ *be constants. For* $\epsilon > 0$ *small enough we choose* R_ϵ *to satisfy*

$$[(q+\frac{1}{2})\log R_\epsilon + \log(15e^3)][\log ||\varphi||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + 2es_\epsilon R_\epsilon] = -\log(\epsilon^\beta + \epsilon).$$

If ϵ *small enough then*

$$m(B_{\epsilon^\beta+\epsilon}) \le R_\epsilon^{-q+\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$B_{\epsilon^\beta+\epsilon} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ |\Phi^\epsilon(z)| \le \epsilon^\beta + \epsilon, \ |z| \le R_\epsilon\}.$$

Proof. Because $||\varphi||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \ne 0$, there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}(x_0) \ne 0$. Then there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$|\widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(x_0)| \ge C_0,$$

if ϵ is small enough. Changing variable if necessarily, we may assume that $|\Phi^\epsilon(0)| \ge C_0$ if ϵ is small enough. If we choose

$$\eta_\epsilon = R_\epsilon^{-q-\frac{1}{2}},$$

then by Theorem 4 of §11.3 in [6] if $|z| \le R_\epsilon$ then

$$|\Phi^\epsilon(z)| \ge \exp\{-[(q+\frac{1}{2})R_\epsilon + \log(15e^3)][\log ||\varphi||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + s_\epsilon R_\epsilon]\} = \epsilon^\beta + \epsilon,$$

except a set of disks whose sum of radii is less than

$$\eta_\epsilon R_\epsilon \equiv R_\epsilon^{-q+\frac{1}{2}}.$$

□

Because $|\widehat{\varphi^\epsilon}(x)| \le \epsilon^\beta + \epsilon$ if $|\widehat{\varphi}(x)| \le \epsilon^\beta$, by Theorem 4 we have immediately

Theorem 5. *Let assumptions and choose* R_ϵ *as in Theorem 4. If* ϵ *small enough then*

$$m(B_{\epsilon^\beta}) \le R_\epsilon^{-q+\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$B_{\epsilon^\beta} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \ |\widehat{\varphi}(x)| \le \epsilon^\beta, \ |x| \le R_\epsilon\}.$$

From Theorem 3 we have

$$|\Phi(z)| \le ||\varphi||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + |z|e^{p^*(|z|+1)}, \tag{3.1}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. So applying Theorem 4 of §11.3 in [6] directly to $\Phi(z)$ we get the following result

Theorem 6. *Let φ have a non-compact support. Let $q > \frac{1}{2}$ be a constant. For $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, define R_ϵ by*

$$[(q+\frac{1}{2})R_\epsilon + \log(15e^3)][1+\log(R_{2\epsilon}) + p^*(2R_\epsilon+1)] = -\log\epsilon.$$

Then

$$m(B_\epsilon) \le R_\epsilon^{-q+\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $m(B_\epsilon)$ is the Lebesgue's measure of the set

$$B_\epsilon = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ |\Phi(z)| \le \epsilon, \ |z| \le R_\epsilon\}.$$

Moreover we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{\log p^*(2R_\epsilon+1)}{\log\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}} = 1.$$

Proof. The conclusion about the size of B_ϵ is obtained similarly that of Theorems 4 and 5. Because

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{p^*(s)}{s} = \infty,$$

in view of the definition of R_ϵ we get

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{\log p^*(2R_\epsilon+1)}{\log\log\frac{1}{\epsilon}} = 1.$$

□

4. Proof of Theorem 1

Because $f_0, f_\epsilon \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ we have

$$||f_0 - f_\epsilon||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \frac{1}{2\pi}||F(f_0) - F(f_\epsilon)||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})},$$

where $F(f_0)(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_0(x)e^{-i\lambda x}dx = \widehat{f_0}, \ F(f_\epsilon)(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_\epsilon(x)e^{-i\lambda x}dx = \widehat{f_\epsilon}$.

We have

$$||F(f_0) - F(f_\epsilon)||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\frac{\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2} - \frac{\widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2}|^2.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
|\frac{\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}}{|\varphi_0|^2} - \frac{\widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2}| \quad &\le \quad |\frac{\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2} - \frac{\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2}| + |\frac{\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2} - \frac{\widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}}{\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2}| \\
&\le \quad \frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}||\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)} + \frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}|}{(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2)} \\
&\quad\quad + \frac{|\widehat{\varphi_0}||\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}||\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|}{(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)(\delta_\epsilon + |\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now using Cauchy's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}||\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)} &\leq \min\{\frac{\widehat{g_0}}{\widehat{\varphi_0}}=|F(f_0)|, \frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^3}\},\\
\frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}-\widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}|}{(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2)} &\leq \frac{|\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}-\widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}|}{\delta_\epsilon}\\
\frac{|\widehat{\varphi_0}||\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}||\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0}-\widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|}{(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2)} &\leq \frac{|\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0}-\widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|}{\delta_\epsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}}|F(f_0)-F(f_\epsilon)|^2d\lambda &\leq 3[\int_{\mathbb{R}}(\frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}||\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)})^2+\int_{\mathbb{R}}(\frac{|\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0}-\widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|}{\delta_\epsilon})^2\\
&\quad+\int_{\mathbb{R}}(\frac{|\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}-\widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}|}{\delta_\epsilon})^2]\\
&= 3[\int_{\mathbb{R}}(\frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}||\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)})^2+\frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}}|\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0}-\widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}}|\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}-\widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

Now we write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}}(\frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}||\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)})^2\\
=\;&\int_{|\lambda|>R_\epsilon,|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|<\epsilon^\beta}(\frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}||\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)})^2+\int_{|\widehat{\varphi}(\lambda)|>\epsilon^\beta}(\frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}||\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)})^2\\
&+\int_{|\lambda|<R_\epsilon,|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|<\epsilon^\beta}(\frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}||\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2(\delta_\epsilon+|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2)})^2\\
\leq\;&\int_{|\lambda|>R_\epsilon,|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|<\epsilon^\beta}(\frac{\widehat{g_0}||\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2})^2+\int_{|\widehat{\varphi_0}(i\lambda)|>\epsilon^\beta}(\frac{\delta_\epsilon|\widehat{g_0}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^3})^2\\
&+\int_{|\lambda|<R_\epsilon,|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|<\epsilon^\beta}(\frac{\widehat{g_0}||\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}}|}{|\widehat{\varphi_0}|^2})^2\\
\leq\;&\int_{|\lambda|>R_\epsilon,|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|<\epsilon^\beta}|F(f_0)|^2+\frac{\delta_\epsilon^2}{(\epsilon^{3\beta})^2}\int_{|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|>\epsilon^\beta}|\widehat{g_0}|^2\\
&+\int_{|\lambda|<R_\epsilon,|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda_\epsilon)|<\epsilon^\beta}|F(f_0)|^2\\
\leq\;&\int_{|\lambda|>R_\epsilon,|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda)|<\epsilon^\beta}|F(f_0)|^2+C_2\frac{\delta_\epsilon^2}{(\epsilon^{3\beta})^2}+\int_{|\lambda|<R_\epsilon,|\widehat{\varphi_0}(\lambda_\epsilon)|<\epsilon^\beta}|F(f_0)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We have $||\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}||_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq ||\varphi_0 - \varphi_\epsilon||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$, a standard procedure give easily that $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} ||\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 0$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
||\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} &\leq 2[||\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}||^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}||\widehat{g_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \\
&\quad +||\widehat{g_0}||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}||\widehat{\varphi_0} - \varphi_\epsilon||^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}] \\
&\leq 2((||\varphi_0||_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + \epsilon)^2 + ||g_0||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})})\epsilon^2 \\
&\leq 2(||\varphi_0||^2_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + ||g_0||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + 1)\epsilon^2
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have

$$||\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq 2(||\varphi_0||^2_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} + ||g_0||^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + 1)\epsilon^2.$$

So we have

$$\frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{g_0}\widehat{\varphi_0} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}|^2 + \frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{g_0}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_0}} - \widehat{g_\epsilon}\overline{\widehat{\varphi_\epsilon}}|^2 \leq C_1\frac{\epsilon^2}{\delta_\epsilon^2}.$$

Combining estimates above we get the conclusion of Theorem 1.

REFERENCES

[1] Saleh Abdullah, *Solvability of convolution equations in D'_{L^p}*, Hokkaido Math. J. 29 (2000), 247–254.

[2] M. V. Aref'eva, *Asymptotic estimates for the accuracy of optimal solutions of an equation of the convolution type*, Zh. vychisl. Mat. mat. Fiz. 14 (1974, 838–851.

[3] Johann Bausmeiter*Stable solutions of inverse problems*, Friedr. Vieweg& Sohn, Braunscweig/Wiesbaden, 1987.

[4] Dang Duc Trong, Nguyen Thanh Long and Pham Ngoc Dinh Alain, *Non homogeneous heat equations: Identification and regularization for the inhomogeneous term*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 312 (2005), 93–104.

[5] D. D. Trong, P. H. Quan and P. N. Dinh Alain, *Determination of a two-dimensional heat source: Uniqueness, regularization and error estimate*, J. Comp. Appl. Maths. 191 (2006), 50–67.

[6] B. Ya. Levin, *Lectures on Entire Functions*, Trans. of Math. Monographs, Vol. 150, AMS, Providence, Rhode Island, 1996.

[7] Alexander G. Ramm, *Inverse problems: mathematical and analytical techniques with applications to engineering*, Springer, Boston, 2005.

[8] Walter Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, Mladinska Knjiga, Ljubljana, 1970.

[9] A. M. Sedletskii, *On the Zeros of Laplace Transforms*, Mathematical Notes 76 (6), 2004, 824–833.

[10] A. F. Voronin, *The Volterra convolution equation of the first kind on a segment*, Fundam. Prikl. Mat. 8 (4), 2002, 955–966.

[11] A. F. Voronin, *An analogue of Picard's theorem for a convolution of the first kind with a smooth kernel*, Russian Math. (Iz. VUZ) 46 (7), 2002, 1–5.

[12] A. F. Voronin, *A uniqueness theorem for a convolution of the first kind with a differentiable kernel on an interval*, Differ. Equation. 37 (10), 2001, 1412–1419.

Dang Duc Trong, Department of Mathematics, Hochiminh City National University, 227 Nguyen Van Cu, Q5, HoChiMinh City, Vietnam
E-mail address: `ddtrong@mathdep.hcmuns.edu.vn`

Truong Trung Tuyen, Department of Mathematics, Indiana University Bloomington, Rawles Hall, IN 47405
E-mail address: `truongt@indiana.edu`